

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00116 01 OF 02 150948Z

17

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00

SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 NRC-05 /089 W

----- 011473

O P 150821Z MAR 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1496

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0116

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES
OF MARCH 12, 1976

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE MARCH 12 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE CANADIAN REP, UK REP AND US REP, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV AND SHUSTOV, POLISH REP DABROWA AND CZECHOSLOVAK REP LAHODA. AS PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED THE SUBJECT MATTER WAS FORCE DEFINITIONS AND EXPERTS FROM THE PARTICIPATING DELEGATIONS WERE PRESENT.

2. THE SESSION, AN EXTRA ONE CALLED AT THE REQUEST OF THE EAST, WAS OF CONSIDERABLE INTEREST. EASTERN REPS DROPPED THEIR MARCH 2 REQUIREMENT FOR PRIOR AGREEMENT ON A GENERAL PRINCIPLE ACCORDING TO WHICH THE THREE DISPUTED FORCE TYPES (SSM, HELICOPTER AND
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00116 01 OF 02 150948Z

GROUND-BASED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE) WOULD BE REALLOCATED

AS A PRECONDITION FOR DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE TOPIC OF INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS. ALLIED REPS PUT FORWARD THEIR VIEWS ON INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS FROM THE WESTERN DRAFT DEFINITION OF NOV 11, 1975. IN THE COURSE OF PUTTING FORWARD THEIR OWN VIEWS ON INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS, EASTERN REPS PROPOSED TO EXCLUDE FROM THE FORCE COUNT, I.E., FROM THE REDUCTION BASE, A NUMBER OF EASTERN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL, WHO EASTERN REPS ASSERTED, PERFORM THE SAME FUNCTIONS AS CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED FORCES IN NATO FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA. EASTERN REPS DECLINED TO QUANTIFY THESE SUGGESTED EASTERN EXCLUSIONS. EASTERN REPS ALSO IMPLIED THAT THEY WERE NOT PREPARED TO EXCLUDE FRG RESERVES (PROBABLY FRG STAND-BY READINESS RESERVES), FROM THE COUNT, BUT DECLINED TO GO FURTHER INTO THIS SUBJECT DURING THE PRESENT SESSION.

KHLESTOV INDICATED THE EAST WISHED TO DISCUSS THE DEFINITIONS ISSUE FURTHER, TURNING NEXT ALSO TO THE DIVISION OF FORCES BETWEEN GROUND OR AIR, BUT HE DID NOT SUGGEST A SPECIFIC DATE FOR A FURTHER INFORMAL SESSION ON DEFINITIONS. WESTERN REPS MADE A STRONG CASE THAT ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA MUST BE INCLUDED IN A DEFINITION. CZECHOSLOVAK REP, WHO MADE THE MAJOR PRESENTATION FOR THE EAST, ADN TO A LESSER EXTENT, POLISH REP, SEEMED NOT TO HAVE MASTERED SUBJECT THOROUGHLY.

3. POLISH REP AS HOST BEGAN SESSION BY ASKING WESTERN REPS FOR WESTERN REACTION TO EASTERN PROPOSAL IN THE SESSION OF MARCH 2 THAT PARTICIPANTS AGREE AS A GENERAL PRINCIPLE TO SOLVE THE ALLOCATION OF THE THREE DISPUTED FORCE TYPES BY ASSIGNING SIMILAR FORCES TO THE SIMILAR SERVICE, EITHER GROUND OR AIR, BOTH IN NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT, POSTPONING SPECIFIC ALLOCATION OF THESE FORCES TO A LATER POINT. UK REP REPLIED FOR ALLIES THAT EASTERN THIRD PRINCIPLE WAS SIMPLY ONE SPECIFIC APPROACH TO SOLVING A PARTICULAR PROBLEM ARISING OUT OF THE SECOND PRINCIPLE OF DIVIDING ALL FORCES IN THE AREA BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR. SINCE THIS WAS AN ISSUE OF DETAIL IT WAS NOT LOGICAL TO ASK PARTICIPANTS TO AGREE ON ITS SOLUTION BEFORE THEY AGREED ON WHAT WAS TO BE INCLUDED AND WHAT WAS TO BE EXCLUDED FROM A FORCE DEFINITION AND HOW THE INCLUDED FORCES SHOULD BE DISTINGUISHED BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR. UK REP ARGUED THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD TURN IMMEDIATELY TO THESE TWO QUESTIONS,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00116 01 OF 02 150948Z

POSTPONING FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CASES TO A LATER POINT.

4. WITH ONLY A SLIGHT SHOW OF RESISTANCE, POLISH REP AGREED WITH THIS PROPOSAL. HE SAID THAT, AS A COMPROMISE AND IN ORDER TO MOVE THE DEFINITION DISCUSSION FORWARD, THE EAST WAS PREPARED TO DISCUSS THE FIRST POINT, ALONG WITH THE OTHER TWO, ALTHOUGH THE EAST WAS NOT ABANDONING ITS POSITION ON THE THIRD POINT.

5. POLISH REP ASKED WESTERN REPS TO LEAD OFF WITH THEIR VIEWS ON WHO SHOULD BE INCLUDED AND WHO SHOULD BE EXCLUDED AS HE PUT IT "FROM REDUCTIONS." UK REP POINTED OUT THAT THE DEFINITIONS DISCUSSION WAS WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE REDUCTION POSITION OF BOTH SIDES AND THAT, AS FAR AS THEY WERE CONCERNED, WESTERN REPS WERE MERELY ESTABLISHING THE BASIS FOR DETERMINING WHICH ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA SHOULD BE COUNTED. INCLUSION OF PERSONNEL IN THE COUNT DID NOT IMPLY WILLINGNESS TO REDUCE THEM. POLISH REP SAID THE EAST WOULD MAINTAIN THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE DISCUSSION WAS WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE REDUCTION APPROACHES OF BOTH SIDES.

6. CANADIAN REP PRESENTED THE WESTERN FORMULATION ON INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS CONTAINED IN WESTERN DRAFT DEFINITION OF NOV 11, 1975. EASTERN REPS ASKED WESTERN REPS TO EXPLAIN THE CONCEPTS OF "ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL" AND "PERSONNEL OF OTHER UNIFORMED ORGANIZATIONS EQUIPPED WITH WEAPONS" AND A DIALOGUE ON THIS TOPIC ENSUED.

7. CZECHOSLOVAK REP THEN DEVELOPED EASTERN VIEWS ON INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS. HE SAID NATO FORCES HAD LARGE NUMBER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL WORKING IN THE ARMED FORCES WHO WERE ESSENTIAL TO THE VIABILITY OF THE FORCES. THESE PERSONNEL PERFORMED SUCH FUNCTIONS AS GUARDS FOR MILITARY OBJECTS, DEPOTS, AND BASES; FOR WORK IN REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE FACTORIES; IN FIELD POST OFFICES; IN MILITARY TRADE ORGANIZATIONS (CANTEENS AND COMMISSARIES); IN COMMUNAL SERVICES; IN CONSTRUCTION UNITS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AIR FIELDS AND OF OTHER INFRA-STRUCTURE OBJECTS; IN MILITARY TRANSPORTATION SERVICES; IN VARIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BODIES OF THE TERRITORIAL FORCES; AND OTHER SERVICES.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00116 02 OF 02 150958Z

17

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00

SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 NRC-05 /089 W

----- 011563

O P 150821Z MAR 76
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1497
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY
USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY
USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0116

FROM US REP MBFR

8. CZECHOSLOVAK REP ASSERTED THESE FUNCTIONS WERE PERFORMED BY BOTH CIVILIANS AND MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE WARSAW PACT FORCES, BUT TO A MUCH LARGER EXTENT BY MILITARY PERSONNEL. IF THE WEST WISHED TO EXCLUDE THE CIVILIANS PERFORMING THESE NECESSARY FUNCTIONS IN THE WEST FROM NATO FORCES, THE EAST SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO EXCLUDE BOTH THE CIVILIANS AND MILITARY PERSONNEL PERFORMING THESE FUNCTIONS FROM A COUNT OF THE WARSAW PACT FORCES.

9. WESTERN REPS STRONGLY CRITICIZED THIS CONCEPT. THEY SAID NO ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL SHOULD BE OMITTED, BUT THAT ALL CIVILIANS SHOULD BE EXCLUDED. THE WEST HAD INCLUDED ONLY ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL IN ITS DEFINITIONS AND DATA. THE WEST HAD EXCLUDED AS NOT CONSTITUTING ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL A VERY LARGE NUMBER OF PERSONS IN THE EAST WHO WERE MEMBERS OF ORGANIZATIONS EQUIPPED WITH WEAPONS. TAKEN TOGETHER, THESE PERSONNEL
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00116 02 OF 02 150958Z

HAD CONSIDERABLE MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE. EVEN IF THE WEST WERE TO APPLY THE EASTERN STANDARD OF ASCRIBING MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE TO SELECTED GROUPS OF CIVILIANS, THEN IT WAS CLEAR THAT THE PERSONNEL THE WEST HAD EXCLUDED ON EASTERN SIDE WERE FAR MORE NUMEROUS AND HAD GREATER MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE THAN THE CIVILIANS THE EAST WISHED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ON THE WESTERN SIDE. THIS EASTERN IDEA WAS A POOR ONE AND SHOULD BE DROPPED.

10. IN REPLY TO QUESTIONS FROM WESTERN REPS, EASTERN REPS SAID THE TERM "MOBILIZATION RESERVES" THEY HAD USED WAS INTENDED TO COVER ALL RESERVES EXCEPT CERTAIN FRG RESERVES. THEY DECLINED TO DISCUSS THE TOPIC FURTHER AT THAT POINT. CANADIAN REP ASKED EASTERN REPS TO QUANTIFY AMOUNT OF EASTERN MILITARY PERSONNEL THEY CLAIMED SHOULD BE EXCLUDED. EASTERN REPS REFUSED, ASSERTING THAT PRESENT DISCUSSION WAS ABOUT ISSUES OF PRINCIPLE. IN SUMMARIZING FOR WEST, UK REP AGAIN ATTACKED EASTERN CONCEPT

OF EXCLUDING CERTAIN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL.

1. IN CLOSING, KHLESTOV SAID THE DISCUSSION HAD BEEN USEFUL AND THAT THE EAST WISHED TO CONTINUE DISCUSSION OF THE PRESENT TOPICS AND ALSO TO TURN TO QUESTION OF DIVIDING FORCES BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR. HE DID NOT ASK FOR A SPECIFIC DATE FOR FURTHER SESSION ON DEFINITIONS. HE CONFIRMED PRIOR AGREEMENT THAT THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION WOULD TAKE PLACE ON MARCH 16 AND BE DEVOTED TO GENERAL QUESTIONS. END SUMMARY.

REMAINDER OF REPORT SENT VIA AIRGRAM.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: CONSULTANTS, MEETINGS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 15 MAR 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: saccheem
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976MBFRV00116
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760096-0995
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760360/aaaacbfc.tel
Line Count: 234
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: saccheem
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 30 MAR 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <30 MAR 2004 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <27 JUL 2004 by saccheem>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF MARCH 12, 1976
TAGS: PARM, XH, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006